

vously now and then, and at my first move it slid into the water and disappeared so suddenly that I was almost sure that it had dived, and I did not see it again. The chick I had left partly in the shell about one-half hour before was now free and struggling to rise. After placing my camera and when nearly ready to make the exposure another chick appeared at the edge of the nest, peeped faintly and was answered by the chick in the nest. Then it climbed up the side and into the nest, climbing over the newly hatched one and I got the picture showing the older one with its wing (showing both digits) resting on an egg and the younger one not yet dry.

I took the older one home with me and it seemed content to nestle in my hand or in a basket. One-half hour later I put it back into the nest and the younger one was not yet dry. They were both quite lively but did not attempt to leave the nest.

The young are born with their eyes open. The body is covered with a thick down, jet black and sooty black beneath; the head and wings are nearly naked; base of bill bright carmine; end of bill orange yellow; a tuft of down under the chin white, with a sprinkling of fine black, giving it a silvery appearance. The eyes show purplish through the skin. The outer digit of the wing is armed with a hooked spur or claw about one-eighth of an inch long, and I noticed a young one use the wing to pull itself up the side of the nest. The feet and legs are dull black.

June 28, there were but two eggs left in the nest and both were pipped. I caught a youngster just as it was getting away through the flags and it was the only one that I could find. I put it up on some bent over flags and got a good picture showing it nearly three-fourths life size with the bare wing and claw and the white beard prominent. It is almost impossible to catch a glimpse of a young one in the nest after they get dry as they leave immediately if they hear one coming, but after I had caught and put them back into the nest they remained still and I had no trouble to focus my camera and make exposures.

I heard the female about several times when I was at the nest but she did not show herself. I visited the nest several times after this date but saw no more of the family.—VERDI BURTCH, *Branchport, N. Y.*

Wilson's Phalarope, A New Species for South Carolina.—On the 7th of September, 1910, while shooting on the eastern end of Sullivan's Island, near Charleston, South Carolina, I killed a Wilson's Phalarope (*Steganopus tricolor*). The bird is a male in winter plumage. It had alighted with about fifteen Yellow-legs on the edge of a freshwater pool left by recent rains. The pool is among sand dunes a few hundred yards from the nearest house and near the car lines. Sullivan's is one of the sea islands and is thickly settled except where the bird was found. The specimen has been deposited in the Charleston Museum (Spec. No. 7249). This is the first record for the species in South Carolina, and, so far as I know, for the Atlantic coast south of New Jersey.—BURNHAM CHAMBERLAIN, *Charleston, S. C.*

Baird's Sandpiper in Massachusetts.—While at Chatham, Mass., I obtained a specimen of Baird's Sandpiper (*Pisobia bairdi*) which was shot October 18, 1910, on Monomoy Point. The identification was verified by Mr. C. J. Maynard, of West Newton, who now has the skin.—Mrs. E. R. JUMP, *West Newton, Mass.*

Eskimo Curlew.—It is rather with a sense of reluctance that I send the following record, knowing the suspicion which is bound to arise but, being an enthusiastic gunner myself, I think it may prove of some interest to that very small body of ornithologists who know anything about shore birds. The record is that of the much discussed Eskimo Curlew. It is only within the last year that I realized that this species was nearing extinction. Such a blunder, however, I consider excusable when I take up any recent text-book or list and find this species still mentioned as our most abundant curlew. I understand, however, that the last record of this species from Long Island was in 1884, or 26 years ago. It seems incredible that for 20 years the absence of this species should have passed without remark, unless it be explained, as the present record must be, on the grounds that every gunner supposed these birds were common enough but that he had never happened to see one.

In 'The Auk,' Vol. XXI, p. 79, I recorded a flight of Hudsonian Godwit on the 31st day of August, 1903. That was the morning after a heavy three days' storm, and on that day a friend of mine, an experienced gunner, shot an Eskimo Curlew at Quogue, L. I. I paid small attention to it at the time, believing it to be a fairly common bird. There can be little doubt that this record is correct. I understand that the record in 'The Auk,' Vol. XXI, p. 289, of a bird of this species shot on Sept. 14, 1902 is incorrect. However, it is a strange coincidence that Dr. Braislin, on the same page, refers to one shot from a flock of about 15 as they were passing along the beach, near Zach's Inlet on August 29, 1903. The storm continued on August 30, clearing on the 31st, when the flight above noted took place at Quogue, the birds coming from the west. Zach's Inlet is about 40-50 miles west of Quogue, so that it would seem that Dr. Braislin's record and mine would fit in rather well together. There seems to me no doubt that this bird was a specimen of the Eskimo Curlew.—FREDERICK WM. KOBBE, *New York City.*

Kalm's Articles on the Passenger Pigeon.—In 'The Auk' for October, 1910, Dr. A. H. Wright published 'Some early records of the Passenger Pigeon' (pp. 428-443) and has referred to Kalm's Travels¹ wherein Kalm promises to "speak of them more particularly in another place" but Dr. Wright was unable to find "another place." The elusive articles by Kalm are practically unknown and Coues failed to find one of them but recorded, in the 'Bulletin' of the United States Geological and Geographical

¹ The original of Kalm's Travels was published in Swedish in 1753-61.